

REMARKS

It is noted there was an objection to the drawings in the first office action in this application. Applicant had prepared a proposed drawing amendment, but inadvertently, it was not submitted with the last reply to the office action. Therefore, applicant submits a proposed amendment to the drawings showing proposed legends for items on Figs. 1, 2 and 3. Upon approval of these proposed drawing changes, applicant will submit revised formal drawings.

The specification has been amended to add headings.

Applicant notes the statement on page 4 of the Office Action that even if the two data packet fields were the same size the two signaling packet fields may not be. The Office action also objects to the term "configuration."

Before responding to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, applicant wishes to quote from the specification on page 6, lines 2-8, as follows:

The gateway (3, 4, 5) also ensures the formatting of the packets in both directions, in order to extract and reform in a single packet (20), the fields (18, 19) from the GSM network, and to send it via the INTERNET (6) by the router (5). The reverse process, of the separation of fields (18, 19) takes place for the packets (20) coming from the INTERNET (6). The terminal (1) carries out the inverse operations to those of the gateway (3, 4, 5) and thus the GSM network is transparent to the INTERNET on the INTERNET packets (20).

Furthermore, applicant points out the description in page 6, lines 20-21:

In this case, the size of the field 18 is limited of that of counterpart field 16. In the same way, the signaling data of the field 19 can be accommodated in the field 17.

As a result of these descriptions, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 6, and 11 to recite limitations in the size and format of the data packet fields, instead of using the word "configuration," and this recitation in the claims is literally supported by the specification. Thus, it is respectively requested that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Applicant and the Examiner are now in agreement that elements P, D and A in Belpaire are processing steps and not data packets or data fields and that DTM is a destination translating means not a header. Basically, in Belpaire, the header or signalling information is separated from the data field and even when reassembled has undergone considerable processing by the DTM. Belpaire must cross-reference the destination addresses between the two networks in a table accessed by the DTM. (Belpaire page 7, lines 20-38.) This is different then providing the Internet addresses in corresponding fields in the SMS protocol for GSM networks and the Internet protocol, which eliminates this type of processing and this type of DTM.

In contrast in the present invention, the signaling field is formatted for a common format in both networks (by modifying the GSM/SMS signaling field) and is routed to the message going out on the other network. In the present invention, the telephone number ID is eliminated (page 6, first full paragraph) and the Internet addressing inserted in the GSM/SMS signalling field (page 5, seventh full paragraph). The GSM/SMS signalling field is constrained in size and format by the necessity of transferring it into the signalling field on the INTERNET with the INTERNET address information already present. (page 5, seventh full paragraph). The data fields are disclosed as being limited to the same size (page 6, third full para., third sentence). That size is limited to 140 bytes (page 6, third full para.).

In regard to the size of the signalling fields, the size is such that each field can be routed to the other field. They could, in fact, be the same size or not, as long as they

are accommodated in the corresponding field without the type of processing disclosed in Belpaire. In addition, the invention provides a customized SMS protocol for the GSM network, which is not disclosed in Belpaire.

The rejection of the claims 1, 6 and 11 is based on the premise that Belpaire shows a gateway between a GSM network and the Internet, and that Svoboda discloses address mapping which is said to teach the technique used by Applicant.

It is also true that Belpaire specifically avails itself of a technique closer to address encapsulation than to address mapping as disclosed in Svoboda, and that Svoboda does not disclose a motivation to use one technique, such as address mapping, over another technique such as address encapsulation.

Thus, the Examiner's picking and choosing of elements of the references is based on Applicant's solution rather than guidance in the references. Belpaire has chosen a different technique, so why would Belpaire modify its technique according to any method in Svoboda?

The present invention uses a particular addressing method avoiding encapsulation (page 3, 2nd paragraph from bottom page). That particular addressing method consists in combining mapping, extended address structure (merging, or adding, the signalling of the packets of one domain to the other, see Claims 1 and 2), and other acts like deleting unuseful fields (claim 3), none of these other acts being described within Svobodova. Svobodova teaches the proxy/alias addressing processes, which are not used in the instant case, the proxy process being an address substitution in the signalling of the packets (Svobodova: page 75, first three paragraphs).

The dependent claims recite specific features of the invention which distinguish from Belpaire and Svoboda as follows:

wherein code words representing signaling of the second network (6) are added as data in the packets that are communicated on the first network (2).

wherein in order to transport the signalling (19) of the packets of the second network (6) into those of the first network (2), code words of the first network, which have no use in connections between two such networks (2, 6), are not included in packets on the first network.

wherein the data are transmitted between a first, GSM network (2) and a second, INTERNET network (6), by accommodating INTERNET addresses in the signalling field of SMS packets.


wherein at the gateway (4), the two packet fields of the second network (18, 19) are extracted from the packets coming from the first network (2) before the two packet fields of the second network are sent on the second network (6) in the form of a packet (20) of the second network (6).

CONCLUSION

In view of the Amendment and Remarks, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. After the amendment, claims 1-15 are still pending and a Notice of Allowance for these claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Michael J. McGovern
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 277-5725
Attorney of Record